

## Stoddard, Jamey

---

**From:** Stoddard, Jamey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 10, 2015 5:06 PM  
**To:** Bray, Dave; Brown, Katherine; Cox, Michael; Eckley, Chris; Edmond, Lorraine; Elleman, Robert; Godsey, Cindi; Grass, Running; Herger, Lillian; Kotchenruther, Robert; LaCroix, Matthew; Latier, Andrea; Morgan, Joseph; Peterson, Erik; Szalay, Endre; Thomas, Jenny; Truskowski, Brent; Weaver, Kerryann  
**Subject:** CHUITNA COAL PDSEIS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW!  
**Attachments:** 309 review general checklist.pdf  
**Importance:** High

Good afternoon.

The PDSEIS is up on the cooperating agency website for review. See Jason's email below for directions on accessing the document section(s).

As you will see the document was not put together in one file, but split into chapters/sections. With that, I will not be downloading the document onto my OneDrive for you all to download, and will instead rely on each of you to download the section(s) you will be reviewing individually. Please contact Kathalyn Tung at AECOM ASAP if you have problems accessing the materials (please cc: me). You should have all received instructions by now.

I have posted the comment table onto my Non-responsive and would ask that everyone work from that Table, as opposed to sending me your individual comments in individual files. You can work directly with the table live and online through Non-responsive, or simply cut and paste from your own file, whichever is easiest and most convenient for you. From the Chuitna folder in my Non-responsive it is under Non-responsive.  
Let me know ASAP if you have not been able to access my Non-responsive

For your reference, I am attaching a general checklist for conducting a NEPA 309 Review (thanks, Erik!). While I think it contains a good list of questions and things to consider when reviewing the document, I don't want folks to limit themselves to this list of questions/issues and simply do a "check-the-box" review thorough the lens of this checklist. As a cooperating agency, our review of the preliminary draft should focus on the scientific and technical adequacy of the analysis and conclusions presented. Obviously this will be different for the difference resource categories.

We will not be writing a formal NEPA 309 letter or developing a rating for this preliminary draft. However, the comments and record we generate during this review will be critical in informing and guiding our formal 309 review and rating at the draft SEIS stage (i.e., if/how issues and comments identified during this review are addressed in the draft SEIS). To that end, I have also included a link to EPA's Policy and Procedure Document for conducting NEPA 309 Reviews. Of particular interest will be Chapter 4, Review of Draft EISs, which describes the rating system and what goes into the specific ratings. Other sections of the document may prove useful for your review as well.

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

-Any other questions you can think of to assist you and your colleagues review? ☺

That's all for now. Just a friendly reminder to please have your comments in by **Friday, December 18.** I will look to reconvene the review group sometime in the next few weeks to get everyone together and discuss the document and any issues identified, as well as to just brainstorm and discuss. It looks like the week after thanksgiving may be an option, but stay tuned.

Now, go forth and do good NEPA!

[http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-08/documents/policy\\_and\\_procedures\\_for\\_the\\_review\\_of\\_federal\\_actions\\_impacting\\_the\\_environment.pdf](http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-08/documents/policy_and_procedures_for_the_review_of_federal_actions_impacting_the_environment.pdf)

---

Jamey L. Stoddard  
Office of Water and Watersheds, NEPA Compliance  
USEPA Region X  
1200 6th Ave, Suite 900, OWW-191  
Seattle, WA 98101  
t. 206.553.6110  
f. 205.553.0165

-----Original Message-----

From: Berkner, Jason R POA [mailto:Jason.R.Berkner@usace.army.mil]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2015 2:06 PM  
To: sara.young@noaa.gov; Al goozmer <al777atthebeach@gmail.com>; betsy\_mccracken@fws.gov; Stoddard, Jamey <Stoddard.Jamey@epa.gov>; Steele, Marie C (DNR) <marie.steele@alaska.gov>  
Cc: Kirkham, Russell A (DNR) <russell.kirkham@alaska.gov>; Dan Graham <dan@pacrimcoal.com>; Joe Lucas <joe@pacrimcoal.com>; Newman, Sheila M POA <Sheila.M.Newman@usace.army.mil>; Kendall@NARF.org; robrosey@gmail.com; Reimer, Gary <gary.reimer@aecom.com>; Tung, Kathalyn <Kathalyn.Tung@aecom.com>; Alvarez, Calvin L POA <Calvin.L.Alvarez@usace.army.mil>; Berkner, Jason R POA <Jason.R.Berkner@usace.army.mil>  
Subject: Chuitna Coal Project PDSEIS (UNCLASSIFIED)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Dear Cooperating Agencies:

The Preliminary Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (PDSEIS) for the Chuitna Coal Project has been posted to the sharepoint site and is available for review. As stated in the schedule discussed on July 8th, today starts the 60 calendar day comment period which ends January 9, 2016.

The word and PDF files for the PDSEIS have been posted to the Sharepoint site under “PDSEIS” in the left column. To help facilitate navigation to newly posted documents when users log on to the Sharepoint site, the main page (<https://extranet.aecom.com/sites/chuitnaseis/Pages/Default.aspx>) shows announcements and newly uploaded or modified folders within the last two weeks. Again, note the files and information accessed on this Sharepoint site are for Cooperating Agency use only and cannot be shared publicly. If you have any questions or difficulties with accessing the Sharepoint site, please feel free to contact Gary Reimer ([gary.reimer@aecom.com](mailto:gary.reimer@aecom.com)) or Kathy Tung ([kathalyn.tung@aecom.com](mailto:kathalyn.tung@aecom.com)).

When submitting comments to the USACE, please use the Comment Matrix provided (also saved on the Sharepoint site in the same folder as the PDSEIS). Email your comments to me at [Jason.R.Berkner@usace.army.mil](mailto:Jason.R.Berkner@usace.army.mil) and please be sure to CC Gary Reimer and Kathy Tung (emails provided above).

We welcome your comments to this preliminary draft. Your comments will help refine and improve this Preliminary Draft SEIS before we prepare the Draft SEIS for public review and comment. You will note that this is indeed preliminary. Our goal is to seek, acquire and respond to comments. We have instructed our contractor not refine the document to the “fit and finish” commensurate with a Draft SEIS because we do anticipate that this comment process will result in changes.

You will see three sections that are incomplete or serve as placeholders. Those are Human Health, Environmental Justice, and Cultural Resources. We anticipate receiving the State-led Health Impact Assessment (HIA) on or shortly after the PDSEIS comment period closes. The HIA report will significantly contribute to and inform the Human Health environmental consequences section. Similarly, the HIA and the Human Health section materially contribute to the Environmental Justice Section which will be completed along with the Draft. Cultural Resources section of the PDSEIS should be viewed as a start and not the finished product because the National Historic Protect Act (NHPA) Section 106 process continues and the USACE is considering relevant submissions from the Native Village of Tyonek.

In a few sections, you will also see notes to reviewers where we highlight areas that we are still refining. We too are using this comment period to continuously improve the document prior to the release of the Draft. We welcome your comments or contributions to those evolving topics as well.

We want to further note that important process steps lay ahead such as the Essential Fish Habitat analysis, Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation and any Programmatic Agreement under the NHPA. Our NEPA process will continue to be informed by documents and processes under related environmental laws.

With the State of Alaska serving as one of our Cooperating Agencies, we are also going to use this comment period opportunity to sharpen 1) our description of the State permitting agency regulatory framework, and 2) the discussion of the foreseeable terms and permit conditions that any subsequent State agency permits would contain. Since a complete list potential "terms and conditions" will not be practicable, the goal is to capture those foreseeable requirements of State authorizations that would be placed upon the project, if permitted.


We would appreciate if you would submit your comments using the attached form. You will see that we are asking for both your comment and any proposed resolution you would like to offer. Experience shows that understanding “the why” as well as “the what” helps us disposition your comments.

Finally, I do want to remind all the agencies that this review of this preliminary draft is confidential. This documents or the information therein shall not be released or permitted to be released to the public or outside groups. You are permitted to share with contractors but it is your responsibility to ensure that this information is not released whether the release is inadvertent or intentional. This document is still a work in progress and this Cooperating Agency review is a process step to improve the document prior to public comment.

Please don’t hesitate to call or email me with any questions. Thank you for taking the time to review this PDSEIS.

Thanks,  
Jason Berkner

Regulatory Division  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
PO Box 6898, 2204 3rd St.  
JBER, Alaska 99506

 (907)-753-5778

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED